

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action mailed January 29, 2007. Claims 1-10, 12-24 and 26-35 are pending in this application. This Amendment amends claims 1, 15, 29, 30, and 35. Reconsideration of the rejected claims and consideration of the newly presented claims is respectfully requested.

I. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-3, 5, 8-10, 12-17, 19, 22-24 and 26-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by *Maslov* (U.S. Patent No. 6,583,673) (hereinafter "*Maslov*"). Applicants respectfully submit that *Maslov* does not disclose each element of the amended claims.

For example, Applicants' claim 1, as amended, recites a method for monitoring multiple online resources in different formats, the method comprising the steps of:

identifying a plurality of online resources to monitor, the plurality of online resources being stored in a plurality of formats, at least one of the plurality of online resources including data in a non-strict architectural structure;

converting each of the plurality of online resources to a strict formatted file having a common format, wherein data in the plurality of formats of the plurality of online resources is converted into a strict architectural structure in the respective strict formatted file;

after converting to the strict formatted file, identifying relevant data based on the strict architectural structure of the data in the strict formatted files using an analytic parser; and

comparing the identified relevant data to a most recent archived copy of the identified relevant data to determine whether the identified relevant data has been altered. (*emphasis added*).

Such limitations are not disclosed by *Maslov*.

Maslov discloses the extraction of digests of structured online documents, and automatic monitoring of the digests. A script that performs online document transformation according to this invention (also called WebTransformer Script) is created. This sample script transforms the source document 10 at FIG.2 to the target document 40. *Maslov* discloses how the transformation is performed. First user selects a source document fragment using a pointing device and selects the "Copy" command. When the "Copy" command is selected, the transformation **script downloads the source document and transforms its fragment into the fragment in the target document.** (*Maslov*, col. 8, lines 30-67). Moreover, to be able to find

the user-selected fragment of the changed source online document, the document model is used in the script. (*Maslov*, col. 10, lines 26-28). The script includes a sequence of "Go To Child" commands that goes from the downloaded treeroot to the document tree node that represents the document fragment selected by the user. (*Maslov*, col. 9, lines 1-5).

Although *Maslov* discloses that the script performs a transformation on a fragment of a user-selected source online document, *Maslov* does not disclose or suggest that **after converting to the strict formatted file, identifying relevant data based on the strict architectural structure of the data in the strict formatted files** using an analytic parser, as recited in claim 1. For purposes of argument, *Maslov* discloses that a transformation occurs. This transformation is performed by the WebTransformer script. The transformation is completed when the script copies the user-selected source document fragment to the target document. (*Maslov*, col. 9, lines 23-25). Assuming this target document is being equated to the converted strict formatted file, as recited in claim 1, and the user-selected fragment is being equated to the identified relevant data of claim 1, *Maslov* fails to disclose finding the fragment after the target document is created. Essentially, **the fragment is found before the transformation occurs**, *i.e.*, before the creation of the target document.

Thus, *Maslov* does not disclose or suggest, "after converting to the strict formatted file, identifying relevant data based on the strict architectural structure of the data in the strict formatted files using an analytic parser," as recited in claim 1. As such, *Maslov* cannot anticipate Applicants' claim 1, or the claims that depend therefrom. Independent claims 15, 29, 30, and 35 recite limitations that similarly are not disclosed by *Maslov*. Thus, *Maslov* cannot anticipate claims 15, 29, 30, and 35 or the claims that depend therefrom. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn with respect to these claims.

II. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 4, 6, 7, 18, 20 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Maslov* and further in view of *Helgeson et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,643,652) (hereinafter "*Helgeson*"). Claims 4, 6, 7, 18, 20 and 21 depend from claims 1 or 15, which as

discussed above are not rendered obvious by *Maslov*. *Helgeson* does not make up for the deficiencies in *Maslov* with respect to claims 1 or 15.

Helgeson teaches mapping between a specific local format and a generic interchange format (col. 2, lines 51-67). *Helgeson* is cited as teaching "converting from the non-hypertext markup language application to a hypertext markup language application" (OA p. 6). *Helgeson* does not teach or suggest, however, **after converting** to the strict formatted file, identifying relevant data based on the strict architectural structure of the data in the strict formatted files using an analytic parser, as required by Applicants' claims 1 and 15.

As *Maslov* and *Helgeson* fail to teach or suggest the elements of these claims, claims 1 and 15 cannot be rendered obvious by *Maslov* and *Helgeson* either alone or in combination. As claims 4, 6, 7, 18, 20, and 21 depend from claims 1 or 15, neither can these claims be rendered obvious. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the rejection with respect to claims 4, 6, 7, 18, 20, and 21 be withdrawn.

III. Amendment to the Claims

Unless otherwise specified, amendments to the claims are made for purposes of clarity, and are not intended to alter the scope of the claims or limit any equivalents thereof. The amendments are supported by the specification and do not add new matter.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 650-326-2400.

Respectfully submitted,

/Naya Chatterjee-Marathe/

Naya Chatterjee-Marathe
Reg. No. 54,680

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 650-326-2400
Fax: 415-576-0300
Attachments
NMC:mg
60981014 v1